



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,404	11/25/2003	Takuya Tamatani	14539-004012	1646
26161	7590	07/17/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			Ouspenski, Ilia I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/721,404

Applicant(s)

TAMATANI ET AL.

Examiner

ILIA OUSPENSKI

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-25 and 27-52 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 53-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/383,551.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/25/03, 3/15/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment/remarks, filed 05/12/2006, are acknowledged.

Claim 26 has been cancelled previously.

Claims 1 – 25 and 27 – 69 are pending.

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group XXIX (claims 53 – 57 and 60 – 69, drawn to a method of identifying a substance that regulates JTT-1 antigen function, comprising contacting a polypeptide comprising the extracellular domain of JTT-1 with a test substance, wherein the test substance is a low molecular weight compound) in the reply filed on 05/12/2006 is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the grounds that Groups XXIX, XXX, and XXXI are species to a generic method of claim 53.

In view of Applicant's argument, the restriction requirement between groups XXIX, XXX, and XXXI has been withdrawn, and the following Species election requirement is set forth herein:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct Species of the claimed Invention (of original Groups XXIX – XXXI), wherein the substance is:

- A. a low molecule weight compound;
- B. a polypeptide; or
- C. an antibody.

These species are distinct because their structures, physicochemical properties and mode of action are different, and they do not share a common structure that is disclosed to be essential for common utility. Furthermore, the examination of these species would require different searches in the scientific literature. As such, it would be burdensome to search these Species together.

However, in the interest of compact prosecution, examination has been extended to include all of the above Species.

3. Claims 1 – 25 and 27 – 52 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

Claims 53 – 69 are under consideration in the instant application.

4. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) in the priority application USSN 09/383,551.

5. The specification on page 1, paragraph 1, should be amended to reflect the status of the priority applications USSN 10/301,056 and 09/383,551.

6. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged. However, the priority application USSN 09/383,551 fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 53 - 69 of this application. Specifically, insufficient support was identified for the method steps recited in the instant claims.

Priority application USSN 10/301,056 appears to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for subject matter claimed in the instant application (e.g. in the originally filed claims of 10/301,056).

Consequently, the instant claims 53 – 69 have been accorded the priority of the filing date of the priority application 10/301,056, i.e. 11/21/2001.

Should Applicant disagree with the Examiner's factual determination above, it is incumbent upon Applicant to provide a showing that specifically supports the instant claim limitations.

7. As discussed supra, this application adds and claims additional disclosure not presented in the priority applications. Since this application names an inventor or inventors named in the prior application, it may constitute a continuation-in-part of the prior application. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of the filing date of the prior application, attention is directed to 35 U.S.C. 120 and 37 CFR 1.78. Applicant is required to amend the first paragraph of the specification to reflect the correct status of this application as a continuation-in-part of the prior application.

8. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention *to which the claims are directed*.

9. Applicant's IDS documents, filed 11/25/2003 and 03/15/2004, are acknowledged, and have been considered.

10. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP §608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Applicant is requested to identify the written support for claims 53 – 69, particularly the method steps recited in the claimed methods. Alternatively, Applicant is invited to amend the specification to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See also sections 6 and 7 *supra*.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 60 – 63 and 67 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 60 – 63 and 67 are indefinite in the recitations of “wherein the test substance activates or stimulates (or inhibits or suppresses) the function of the JTT-1 antigen,” because the recitations lacks antecedent basis in the respective base claims, which do not recite steps of testing whether the substances activate or inhibit JTT-1. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Applicant is reminded that any amendment must point to a basis in the specification so as not to add new matter. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06.

13. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

14. Claims 53 – 55 and 57 – 63 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The following *Written Description* rejection is set forth herein.

Applicant is not in possession of a generically recited “JTT-1 antigen.”

The specification does not provide sufficient structural or functional description of the molecule claimed under laboratory designation “JTT-1 antigen.” Therefore, the skilled artisan cannot envision all the contemplated amino acid sequence possibilities encompassed by the instant claims.

A description of a genus of protein sequences may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of polypeptide sequences, defined by amino acid sequence, falling within the scope of the genus, or of a recitation of structural features common to the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly&Co., 119F3d 1559, 1569, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

The Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 "Written Description" Requirement make clear that if a claimed genus does not show actual reduction to practice for a representative number of species; then the Requirement may be alternatively met by reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the genus (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 column 3).

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.). Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

16. Claims 53 - 69 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being obvious over Tamatani et al. (US Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0115831, published 08/22/2002; see entire document).

Tamatani et al. teach a polypeptide "JTT-1," which has an amino acid sequence identical to the instantly claimed SEQ ID NO:2 (see entire document, in particular, e.g. Figure 10). Tamatani et al. further teach fusion polypeptides comprising JTT-1, or the extracellular portion of JTT-1, or a homodimer of two extracellular portions of JTT-1, with the constant region of human immunoglobulin heavy chain (e.g. Example 16 at

pages 29 – 30, and paragraph 0069). Therefore, Tamatani et al. teach the same polypeptide molecules as instantly claimed.

Tamatani et al. do not specifically exemplify methods of identifying substances that regulate JTT-1 antigen, although they point out the usefulness of such approach, in disclosing that JTT-1 transgenic mice can be used for developing pharmaceuticals that regulate JTT-1.

However, it was well within the skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the method steps as recited in the instant claims, because such methods were standard in the art for obtaining molecules that interact with defined targets. Given the motivation provided by Tamatani et al., and the routine nature of the experimentation, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, and have a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the claimed methods.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the reference and the state of the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

17. The nonstatutory **double patenting** rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

18. Claims 53 – 69 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory **obviousness-type double patenting** as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 24 of copending Application USSN 10/800,250. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is no manipulative difference between the methods claimed in the two applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

19. Claims 53 – 69 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1 – 24 of commonly assigned USSN 10/800,250, for the reasons set forth above.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned USSN 10/800,250, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

20. Conclusion: no claim is allowed.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is 571-272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

Art Unit: 1644

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ILIA OUSPENSKI, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1644

July 11, 2006

Philip Gambel
PHILLIP GAMBEL, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TC 1600
7/11/06